

and he averred, that the judgments of *Slye, Love*, and the *Barbers*, never had been satisfied, and that they had been regularly assigned to the defendant *Carroll* for a valuable consideration. The defendant *Robert Oliver*, by his answer, states and avers, that the amount for which he had obtained judgments against *The Cape Sable Company* in Anne Arundel County Court was for money lent and actually applied to the use of that body politic; that the decisions of this court of the 21st of April, 1823, and the 7th of May, 1824, so vitally attacked that judgment as perfectly to nullify it; and that therefore, and with a view, in the most effectual manner, to correct and remove those great informalities which had been pointed out, and were considered as so fatal to that judgment, the suit was instituted and a judgment obtained in Baltimore County Court, on the 26th of May, 1824, for the same debt, &c. as alleged by the plaintiff. This defendant denies all fraud, &c. The defendant *Carroll*, in his answer states, that he was applied to by the defendant *Harper* and others for the loan of money to relieve the embarrassments of *The Cape Sable Company*; and that he, after some negotiation, agreed to lend his money, and took as a security for the money so lent to that body politic an assignment of the judgments of *Slye, Love*, and the *Barbers*, which were then and yet remain in full force, and wholly unsatisfied; and that he caused writs of *fieri facias* to be issued on them, as stated in the bill; that as to the judgments which appear to have been confessed in actions of debt on the judgments originally of *Slye, Love*, and the *Barbers*, in Baltimore County Court on the 4th of June, 1824, they were obtained in consequence of a misunderstanding of his attorney, and because he was ignorant, that executions had previously issued to Anne Arundel County; but those judgments will be vacated, or otherwise disposed of so as to keep them harmless, in such manner as the Baltimore County Court may, at its next term, direct. This defendant alleges, that he is ignorant of the other matters stated in the bill; and he denies all fraud, &c.

Upon these answers the case was brought before the court on a motion to dissolve the injunction.

10th November, 1824.—BLAND, Chancellor.—The motion to dissolve the injunction standing ready for hearing, and the solicitors of the parties having been fully heard, the proceedings were read and considered.

This case has been gathered into the shape in which it is now presented to the court in three separate parcels, commenced at